

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added.

Claims 1, 12, 13-22 and 24 are currently being amended, whereby claims 1 and 13 have been amended to respectively include the features of dependent claims 11 and 23.

Claims 12, 23 and 25-31 are currently being canceled.

This amendment and reply amends and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 1-11, 13-22 and 24 are pending in this application.

Request for entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since: a) it does not raise any new issues since independent claims 1 and 13 now includes the features of their respective dependent claims 11 and 23 (now canceled), and b) it lessens the number of potential issues for appeal (by overcoming the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection raised in the Office Action and by canceling claims 25-31).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101:

In the Office Action, claims 13-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter, since the specification is “currently not believed to enable the computer readable medium to act as a computer hardware component and realized its functionality absent being claimed in combination with the necessary hardware component to receive and convert the hardwired, wireless, or a combination of hardwired or wireless to computer useable code.”

In reply, although Applicants do not agree with this rejection for the reasons set forth in the previously-filed reply, Applicants have amended claims 13-24 in the manner suggested on page 2 of the Office Action, whereby presently pending claims 13-24 are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,151,438 to Hall et al. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 recites:

displaying, on a first display screen, one or more of the business level objects as connected links; and

displaying, as connected links on a second display screen when one of the connected links on the first display screen is selected by a user, one or more of the application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the business level objects.

See, for example, the description on page 9 of the specification and Figures 1-3 of the drawings.

The Office Action asserts that Figures 5-16 and the text in the specification further expanding those figures teaches and suggests the above features of claim 1, but Applicants respectfully disagree. In more detail, Hall et al. is directed to a wireless device that provides real-time alerts in response to changes in business operational data. In Hall et al., an operating systems layer 20 that represents an enterprise's operational systems with which the solution operates, is provided as a bottom tier layer. An enterprise application integration (EAI) services layer 30 that provides the connectivity between back-end data systems of the operational systems layer 20 and an analytics engine 42 of a third tier is provided as a middle tier layer. Also, an analytics services layer 40 that corresponds to a multi-dimensional data mart is provided as a third tier layer. See columns 7 and 8 of Hall et al., for example.

Figure 5 of Hall et al. shows a display of a hand-held device 110, whereby icons are provided on that display for selection by a user. In more detail, an industry selection screen 110 is shown in Figure 5, which includes a number of icons including hyperlinks to

informational screens relating to the selected industry. Figure 6 shows the display of the hand-held device 110 when the airline icon 112 of Figure 5 has been selected by a user. See column 15, lines 23-33 of Hall et al.

Figure 7 of Hall et al. shows the data statistics for critical business metrics related to selection of the flight operations icon of Figure 6 that was selected by a user, whereby those critical business metrics are displayed on the display. See column 15, lines 49-63 of Hall et al.

None of Figures 5-16 of Hall et al. shows its icons on a display being connected to other icons via links; rather, each icon is separate from the other icons displayed on the display. Thus, Hall et al. does not disclose or suggest the above-referenced features of claims 1 and 13, in which business level objects are linked to at least one other business level object by way of connections on a first display and in which application level objects are linked to at least one other application level object by way of connections on a second display.

As such, since no connected links are shown or suggested in Hall et al., it cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 13.

Still further, with respect to claims 12 and 24 (which depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively), those claims recite:

displaying, as connected links on a third display screen when one of the connected links on the second display screen is selected by a user, one or more of a lower level of application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the application level objects displayed on the second display screen.

Hall et al. do not disclose or suggest such a third display screen of application level objects that provides a drill down from a second display screen of application level objects, nor does Hall et al. disclose or suggest displaying, as connected links on a third display screen, one or more lower level application level objects that are correlated with one or more application level objects.

Accordingly, dependent claims 12 and 24 are not anticipated by Hall et al. for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 10, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819